

# **DELTA PROTECTION COMMISSION STRATEGIC PLANNING**

## **Summary of Documents Related to Current and Future State of the Delta**

**February 2, 2006**

*[Note: The following summary is based on a review of selected documents from governmental and non-governmental sources available at the time and does not represent a comprehensive review of all the source documents which might address strategic issues of concern for the Delta.]*

### **General Plans for the five counties in the Delta:**

<b>County</b>	<b>Last Update</b>	<b>Next Update</b>	<b>Mechanism*</b>
Contra Costa	January 2005	2020	Don't know about DPC
Sacramento	1993	On track for approval by year end, 2006	No changes anticipated that qualify – no known DPC mechanism in place
San Joaquin	Left message – haven't heard back		
Solano	June 2002	2020	Concerned with BCDC marsh protection area in plan - no known DPC mechanism in place
Yolo	1983	On track for approval by year end or early 2007	No known DPC mechanism in place

**\*Mechanism = “Is there any mechanism in place to ensure consistency of general plan updates with the DPC Land Use and Resource Management Plan?”**

**Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta. Delta Protection Commission, February 23, 1995.**

This is the source document that is required by the Delta Protection Act of 1992 and is fundamental to understanding and implementing the mission, goals and focus of the Commission, both strategically and operationally.

The Primary and Secondary Zones are identified schematically as those defined in Water Code 12220. There are eight sections for the plan: Environment, Utilities and Infrastructure, Land Use, Agriculture, Water, Recreation and Access, Levees, and Marine Patrol, Boater Education, and Safety Programs. In addition, there is a separate section on Implementation.

For each of the eight sections, there is a narrative introduction to the issues containing several paragraphs, a sentence- or paragraph-long goal statement (absent from the last section on Boating), 134 findings, 49 policies, and 66 recommendations. For the Implementation section, there is a similar narrative introduction to the issues, a description of local government responsibilities as defined by the 1992 act, a description of the Commission's responsibilities, comments on long-term implementation, and five implementation recommendations, four of which correspond to the responsibilities outlined in the enabling legislation, the fifth corresponding to the requirement for an annual report.

What the Delta Protection Commission has become inside this 1992 Act is a land use planning agency that ensures adherence of local implementing authorities (cities and counties acting through their general plan requirements) to a regional land use plan that unites the Delta across multiple jurisdictions. Since primary implementing authority rests with the local jurisdictions, the Commission functionally exercises a watchdog role over consistency of the various general plans with the Commission's regional plan. It reports annually to the Governor and the Legislature in this role. Beyond these responsibilities, any person aggrieved by any action taken by a local government or other local agency in implementing the Commission's plan may appeal to the Commission. The Commission may hear such appeals and either deny the appeal or remand to the implementing agency for reconsideration, after issuing findings. Judicial review is the final appeal on the Commission's plan or any appealable matter described in the Act.

**2004 Report to the Governor and the Legislature on the Activities of the Delta Protection Commission. Delta Protection Commission, no date.**

This is the most recent report required annually by the act for activities completed in calendar 2004. It complies with those requirements.

**California Water Plan Highlights (Public Review Draft). State of California Department of Water Resources, April 2005.**

This is the 7<sup>th</sup> update of the California Water Plan (Bulletin 160 – 05) issued since 1957 by the Department of Water Resources. It provides a broad framework for action on California's water needs through 2030, based on three different scenarios: water needs in the urban, agricultural and environmental sectors consistent with current trends, those same needs at a less intense level than current trends, and at a higher intensity than current trends. The current trend scenario is used as the base and an overdraft of 2 million acre-feet per year is projected as a gap to recharge groundwater. In all scenarios, the water supply comes up short to recharge groundwater, but the higher resource intensive scenario shows a 6 million acre-feet gap, triple the current trends.

DWR's plan proposes the concept of integrated regional water management and improvements in statewide water management systems. How this translates for the state is to continue working through CALFED in the Bay Delta system, and extend water management approaches so that all levels of planning and implementing agencies are involved. The Delta is a key area of focus in this plan. A series of fourteen recommendations address the implementation of the plan update, with an emphasis on state leadership for regional planning and management. Land-use planning is not specifically mentioned in this draft, high-level summary.

**AB 1200**

Legislation passed this year requiring DWR and DFG to create 50-, 100- and 200-year visions for sustainability of the Delta. Key areas to be considered include discrete and interactive effects on subsidence, earthquakes, floods, and changes in precipitation, temperature and ocean levels. DPC has already contacted the responsible agencies and received assurances that DPC's input on land use matters will be included in the report.

**California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, *California Farmland Conversion Report, 2000 – 2002 (Executive Summary) and 2002 – 2004 Mapping Update:***

The urbanization of California's farmland is proceeding apace with the leading county being San Joaquin. The rate of conversion from farmland to urban use (including residential, commercial and public use) is increased slightly to about 2% faster conversion. Total acres converted in San Joaquin County was 6,211 acres in 2000 – 2002 and 11,407 acres in 2002 – 2004. This compares to a statewide loss of nearly 54,000 acres in 2000 – 2004 and a probably higher but as yet undocumented loss in 2002 – 2004.